DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 367 HE 016 906

AUTHOR Ott, Mary Diederich; Markewich, Theodore S.
TITLE Report of the Security Survey at the University of Maryland at College Park. Executive Summary.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Office of Institutional Studies.
PUB DATE Jun 83
NOTE 52p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Crime; Crime Prevention; Higher Education; Institutional Research; Questionnaires; School Personnel; *School Security; *Security Personnel; State Universities; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *University of Maryland College Park

ABSTRACT

The level of concern about security problems at the University of Maryland at College Park and the use of available security measures and services were investigated in May 1983. A randomly-selected sample of 764 students, 571 employees, and 31 campus police were surveyed. Higher response rates were obtained from women than from men, and from on-campus students than from commuters. Among employees, the estimated response rates were highest for associate staff (64 percent), followed by faculty (30 percent), and classified employees (25 percent). More women than men respondents and more student than employee respondents were concerned for personal safety, and the greatest concern was for night hours. The primary areas of concern were walking in or near parking lots and walking elsewhere outdoors. Substantial proportions of students expressed concern about their safety in the residence halls, the libraries, classroom buildings, and other campus buildings. Awareness and use of the following security services were also determined: campus police vehicle patrols and escort service, the residence hall security program, crime prevention programs, and police assistant patrols at doors to buildings. (Author/SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED238367

HE

REPORT OF THE SECURITY SURVEY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK

Mary Diederich Ott and Theodore S. Markewich

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

June 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Diederich Ott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES
University of Maryland at College Park

HE016906

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A survey of security measures and services at the University of Maryland at College Park was designed by the Office of Institutional Studies at UMCP, at the request of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs. The survey's objective was to determine the level of concern about security problems and the awareness and use of available security measures and services. The survey was designed and administered in May, 1983, shortly before the conclusion of the spring term.

The survey was distributed to randomly selected members of three populations--students, employees, and UMCP police. The sampling proportions for these populations were 10 percent, 30 percent, and 100 percent, respectively. The estimated response rates were 25 percent for students, 31 percent for employees, and 46 percent for police. The numbers of respondents were 764 students, 571 employees, and 31 police.

Higher rates of response were obtained from women than from men, and from on-campus students than from commuters. Among employees, the estimated response rates were highest for associate staff (64 percent), followed by faculty (30 percent), and classified employees (25 percent). The high rate of nonresponse was expected for a mail survey without follow-up, and was exacerbated by the fact that the survey was conducted during the last two weeks of the term.

Greater rates of response among women and on-campus students were associated with greater proportions of these respondents being concerned about their personal and/or belongings' safety on campus, causing a probable bias in the survey results. If non-response were in part caused by a lack of concern with security, proportions of the survey respondents who were concerned would overestimate the proportions concerned among the survey populations. Because of the problem of nonresponse bias, the results of this study can only be generalized to survey respondents rather than to the survey populations.

The survey focused on two major areas: concern about one's safety or the safety of one's personal belongings on campus; and the awareness, use, and assessment of campus security measures or services.

In regard to concern for one's personal safety, higher proportions of women than of men, and higher proportions of student than of employee respondents, indicated concern. Large proportions of persons expressing concern about their personal safety indicated that the nighttime hours were of concern. The primary areas of concern were walking in or near parking lots and walking elsewhere outdoors. Substantial proportions of students expressed concern about their safety in the residence halls, the libraries, classroom buildings, and other campus buildings. Somewhat greater proportions of employees than of students were concerned about their safety in other campus buildings, e.g., in offices.

In regard to the safety of one's belongings, over three-quarters of employee and student respondents indicated concern, with greater proportions of women employees than of men expressing concern. All respondent groups expressed concern about the safety of vehicles parked on campus. Among students, residence halls and libraries were also major areas of concern. Among employees, other campus buildings were the major area of concern.

On average, respondents indicated that they were more concerned about their safety and their belongings' safety on campus than in their home neighborhood.

Awareness of security measures and services varied by type of service, with the largest proportions of employees and students aware of UMCP police vehicle patrols and the escort service. Fewer student and employee respondents were aware of the residence hall security program, police assistant patrols at doors to libraries or other buildings, or UMCP police crime prevention programs.

The service that the largest number of student respondents had used was call-a-ride. The service that the largest number of employee respondents had used was UMCP police crime prevention programs. The total proportions of respondents who reported they had used any of the five services was 28 percent of students and 15 percent of employees.

In assessing the adequacy of security measures and services, in all three respondent groups and for both sexes, larger proportions of respondents indicated that measures were not adequate

than indicated they were adequate. A substantial proportion of student and employee respondents indicated they did not know whether or not services were adequate.

When asked to indicate what changes if any should be made in nine security measures or services, the responses varied by type of service and by respondent group. Among the findings were the following:

1) student and police foot patrols should be increased, or improved and increased;
2) call-a-ride is all right at present;
3) security lighting outdoors should be increased, or improved and increased; and
4) police respondents tended to indicate that police crime prevention programs should be improved, or improved and increased.

Regarding the question of whether a greater or smaller proportion of the campus budget should be spent on security, the mean response supported increasing the proportion spent on campus security.

Finally, a large number of respondents made specific suggestions concerning security measures and services on campus. A compilation of these comments is available in a separate document.

REPORT OF THE SECURITY SURVEY

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK

Mary Diederich Ott and Theodore S. Markewich

June 1983

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES
University of Maryland at College Park

Introduction

The security survey was designed by the Office of Institutional Studies of the University of Maryland at College Park, at the request of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs. The objective of the survey was "to assess the actual and perceived degree of security problems and the levels of responsiveness the various campus service units are able to achieve with the resources available to them" (Sturtz, Note 1). The survey was designed and administered in May, 1983, shortly before the conclusion of the spring term. (See Appendix A.)

Sampling

The members of the campus community were divided into three populations: UMCP police; all other employees (excluding work-study students, graduate assistants and fellows); and those students who were not included in the employee population. The sampling rates varied for the three groups: 100 percent sample for police, 30 percent for employees, and 10 percent for students, producing the following sample sizes: 67 police; 1,866 employees out of approximately 6,220 permanent and temporary employees; and 3,457 students out of a Spring 1983 population of 34,568. Employees and students were selected using computerized randomization programs.

Although the student sample initially contained 3,457 names, 298 had confidential address information, preventing their inclusion in the sample and reducing the sample size to 3,159. Seven

hundred thirty-five regular employees included in the employee or police population were registered to take classes in Spring 1983.* Approximately 74 such employees were included in the original student sample. Removing these employees from the student sample reduced the student sample to 3,085. Finally, 760 students officially withdrew between the close of registration in the spring and the time the survey was administered. Approximately 76 of these students were included in the student sample. Removing these 76 students from the sample brought the sample size to 3,009. Thus the final student population (30,090) comprises those students who were registered in Spring 1983, who were not regular university employees, who had addresses that were not confidential, and who did not officially withdraw.

Response Rates

The security survey was mailed to employees and to dormitory students by campus mail, and to commuting students by U.S. mail, on Wednesday, May 11, 1983. This was two days before the last day of classes for the spring term, and nine days before the last day of final examination week (May 20th). Responses were requested by May 18 in order to encourage response before students and some employees left campus for the summer. Responses were accepted until May 25, at which time data entry was completed, using VIEW screens on the HP computer. Because of the short time

---

*Based on the fact that 735 employees received tuition remission in Spring 1983 for courses taken at UMCP.

period available for conducting the survey and the requirement of anonymous return of surveys, follow-up of nonrespondents was impossible.

The response rates were substantial, considering the fact that this was a mailed survey with no follow-up. However, they were lower than required to consider the respondents representative of their respective populations. The response rates for the three samples were as follows:

Sample	Number of Responses	Sample Size	Response Rate
Police	31	67	46.3%
Employee	571	1,866	30.6%
Student	764	3,009	25.4%

The difficulty with low rates of response is the likelihood of substantial nonresponse biases in the survey results. Considering the topic of the survey, one might expect that those who responded were more interested in or concerned about campus security than were those who did not respond (Lansing & Morgan, 1971, p. 160). A measure of differential rates of response because of differing degrees of concern may be the response rates of males and of females in the samples. A higher response rate from females than from males in the same sample, together with greater proportions of female respondents than of males indicating concern for their own or their belongings' safety, would tend to indicate that those subgroups (in this case, females) with greater concern about security were more likely to respond to the survey. As we will discuss in detail, we found that female

respondents were more concerned about their personal safety than men were, and women responded at a higher rate than men did. Another group that may be particularly concerned about security is students living on campus. They accounted for approximately 23 percent of the student sample, and 30 percent of the respondents. A higher proportion of resident students than of commuters were concerned about their personal safety and the safety of their belongings, as will be discussed later. Apparently the groups that were more concerned about their personal safety, and/or the safety of their belongings, were more likely to respond than were other groups.

Nonresponse because of lack of interest or concern with security would tend to bias the measures of the proportion of persons on campus who were concerned with their security. If nonresponse were in part caused by lack of concern with security, then survey estimates of the population proportions of those who were concerned would overestimate the actual proportions who were concerned. Nonresponse would have less effect on the measures of where and when one is concerned about security, because these measures were analyzed only for those who indicated concern for their safety or their belongings' safety.

In addition to lack of concern or interest in security, other possible reasons for nonresponse include the following:

1) general unwillingness to complete any survey;
2) not being available at the time of the survey (e.g., employees who were not on campus from May 12 to May 24);

3) not receiving the survey, e.g., because of incorrect addresses. (Of the student surveys, 52 (1.7%) were returned because of changes in address or incorrect address.)

4) lack of time to complete the survey because of end-of-term tests, work requirements, and so forth;

5) the short time-period available for responding to the survey. Following the cut-off date for data entry of May 25, surveys continued to be returned. An additional 16 employee surveys and 38 student surveys were received after the cut-off date.

Although nonresponse bias affects proportions and means of responses, when comparing two means across samples, if the proportions of nonresponse in two classes are approximately equal, relative bias between the means will occur only if the effect of nonresponse bias on one class mean is much different from that on the other. "Even when separate estimates have nonresponse biases, their differences often are relatively free of bias, because of similar effects of nonresponse on the compared class means" (Kish, 1965, p. 536). Thus it may be appropriate to compare proportions of respondents who were concerned for male employees vs. male students, or for female employees vs. female students, despite the effect of nonresponse bias on the individual proportions.

In general we report unweighted proportions or means of responses by sample and by sex, without correcting for non-

response bias. Because of the problem of nonresponse bias, the results of this study can only be generalized to the respondents of the survey, rather than to the survey populations.

Analysis

Characteristics of Respondents

The surveys were analyzed for each population, and by sex of respondent. Surveys on which the respondent's sex was not indicated were not included in the analysis (i.e., six student surveys and one employee survey). The breakdown of respondents by sample and by sex is indicated in Table 1.

Table 1.

Numbers of respondents by sample and by sex of respondents.

	Sample		
Sex	Student	Employees	Police
Males	321 (42.3%)	262 (46.0%)	27 (87.1%)
Females	437 (57.7%)	308 (54.0%)	4 (12.9%)
Total	758 (100.0%)	570 (100.0%)	31 (100.0%)

Clearly a larger proportion of female than of male employees, and of female than of male students responded to the survey, although women comprised less than half of the employees (46.6%) and less than half of the students (47.5%) on campus. Based on estimated numbers for each sample, the response rates by sample and by sex are given in Table 2. Clearly there was a

higher response rate from females than from males in each sample.

Table 2.

Response rates by sample and by sex of respondents.

Sex	Sample: Students	Employees	Police
Males	20.3%	26.3%	45.0%
Females	30.6%	35.4%	57.1%
Total	25.2%	30.5%	46.3%

The breakdown of respondents by sample and by racial or ethnic category is given in Table 3.

Table 3.

Numbers of respondents by sample and by racial or ethnic category.

Racial/ethnic category	Sample: Students	Employees	Police
American Indian or Alaskan native	8 (1.1%)	5 (0.9%)	1 (3.2%)
Black, not of Hispanic origin	35 (4.6%)	34 (6.0%)	1 (3.2%)
Asian or Pacific Islander	36 (4.7%)	11 (1.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Hispanic	13 (1.7%)	5 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)
White, not of Hispanic origin	655 (86.4%)	510 (89.5%)	27 (87.1%)
Other	5 (0.7%)	3 (0.5%)	2 (6.5%)
No Response	6 (0.8%)	2 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	758 (100.0%)	570 (100.0%)[a]	31 (100.0%)

[a]Totals do not add because of rounding.

These proportions of responses for employees and students differ from the respective population proportions primarily in that Whites are overrepresented and Blacks are underrepresented among respondents.

Among student respondents, 223 (29.6%) indicated they lived on campus. This is somewhat higher than the proportion of on-campus residents in the survey sample (22.8%). Methods of commuting are indicated in Table 4 for commuting students, employees, and police who responded to this question.

Table 4.

Methods of commuting, by sample.

	Sample		
Method of Commuting	Students(N=530)	Employees(N=551)	Police(N=31)
On foot	7.2%	2.2%	0.0%
By bicycle	0.6	2.0	0.0
By car or motorcycle	75.7	85.1	96.8
By Shuttle UM	5.5	0.9	0.0
By public transportation	0.8	1.5	0.0
Other	10.4	8.3	3.2
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

"Other" methods of commuting included van pools, apartment shuttles, and combinations of the methods listed in Table 4.

As one would expect, the employees and police were older on average than were the students, and, on average, had been at UMCP a greater number of years than had the students. See Table 5.

Table 5.

Mean age and years spent at UMCP, by sample.

	Sample		
Means	Students	Employees	Police
Age (in years)	23.9	40.6	36.2
Years at UMCP	2.7	9.5	9.4

Among the employee sample respondents, 14.6 percent indicated that they were also students at UMCP. Of the employee population, we estimated that 220 (11.8%) members were also students. The slightly larger proportion of students among the employee respondents may be accounted for by those who were registered at University College rather than at UMCP. Eight (25.8%) of the 31 police respondents indicated they were students. Among the student sample respondents, 16.5% indicated they were employed at UMCP, as graduate assistants, resident assistants, or as student employees of one type or another. Students indicated a wide variety of campus jobs.

The distribution of the students among student categories is given in Table 6, for respondents and for all registered students as of the third week of the spring term.

Table 6.

Distribution among student categories of respondents and of registered students.

Student Category	Group: Student Sample Respondents		Group: All Registered Students
Freshman	113	(14.9%)	5,393 (15.6%)
Sophomore	112	(14.8%)	5,376 (15.6%)
Junior	161	(21.2%)	6,278 (18.2%)
Senior	200	(26.4%)	8,127 (23.5%)
Graduate Student	153	(20.2%)	6,399 (18.5%)
Other	18	(2.4%)	2,995[a] (8.7%)
No response	1	(0.1%)	
Total	758	(100.0%)	34,568 (100.0%)

"Other" students included special students, Golden I.D., persons pursuing a second undergraduate degree, etc.

The distribution by employee category is indicated in Table 7 for the population as of June 7, 1983, for the sample and for respondents. The numbers include both permanent and temporary employees. The sample numbers are estimates equalling 30 percent of each category of the population. Finally we report the estimated response rate by employee category.

[a]Includes special graduate and undergraduate students and unclassified students.

Table 7.

Distribution among employee categories.

Employee Category[a]	Population N	Population %	Sample (Estimated) N	Sample (Estimated) %	Respondents N	Respondents %	Estimated Response Rate %
Faculty	2484	39.9%	745	39.9%	227	39.8%	30.5%
Associate Staff	486	7.8	146	7.8	93	16.3	63.7
Classified, other than housekeeper or police	3135	50.4	941	50.4	238	41.8	25.3
Housekeeper	115	1.8	34	1.8	3	0.5	8.8
Other[b]					7	1.2	
No response					2	0.4	
Total	6220	100.0%	1866	100.0%	570	100.0%	30.5%

[a]Graduate assistants are included in the student sample; police are included in the police sample.

[b]Other employees included storekeeper, department administrator, etc.

Clearly the response rate of associate staff (estimated to be 63.7 percent) far exceeded the other response rates, whereas that of housekeepers (8.8 percent) was far below the average. Because of the small numbers of respondents among housekeepers, their responses were analyzed with those of the other classified employees, with an overall estimated response rate for classified employees of 24.7 percent. Although not indicated in Table 7, the estimated response rate of male classified employees was only 12.8 percent, whereas that of female classified employees was 32.1 percent.

Survey Results

The survey focused on two major areas: 1) concern about one's personal safety and the safety of one's personal belongings on campus; and 2) awareness, use, and assessment of campus security measures or services.

Concern about Personal Safety and Safety of Belongings

Respondents were asked to respond "yes" or "no" to the following questions: "Are you concerned about your personal safety on campus?" and "Are you concerned about the safety of your personal belongings on campus?" The total numbers of respondents to the question about personal safety and the proportions of these respondents who were concerned about their personal safety on campus are given in Table 8.

Table 8.

Total number of respondents to the question, and proportions concerned about their personal safety.

Sex	Sample: Students	Employees	Police
Males	P = .486 N = 319	P = .249 N = 261	P = .462 N = 26
Females	P = .924 N = 434	P = .731 N = 305	P = .500 N = 4
All Respondents	P = .738 N = 753	P = .509 N = 566	P = .467 N = 30

It is clear that among students and employees a higher proportion of the women than of the men were concerned about their personal safety on campus. Moreover, a greater proportion of students than of employees were concerned about their personal safety. Fully 92 percent of women students indicated that they were concerned about their personal safety. Among police, the overall proportion concerned was similar to that of other employees (47 percent for police, 51 percent for other employees).

Respondents were asked to indicate the time(s) of day and location(s) on campus at which they were concerned about their personal safety. These responses were analyzed for all those who had indicated in the previous question that they were concerned about their personal safety on campus.*

*In considering responses to this question, one must remember that the survey was conducted in mid-May, when sunrise was at about 6:30 A.M. and sunset at about 8 P.M. A number of respondents pointed out that their responses would have been different if the survey had been conducted when sunset occurred by 5 P.M.

The responses to this question were in the form of a grid, as shown below. Respondents were instructed to check the boxes on the grid to indicate where and when they were concerned about their personal safety on campus.

TIME OF DAY						
6 AM-10 AM	10 AM-2 PM	2 PM-6 PM	6 PM-10 PM	10 PM-2 AM	2 AM-6 AM	LOCATION ON CAMPUS
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	1-in the Residence Halls
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	2-in the Libraries
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	3-in the Classrooms
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	4-in Other Campus Buildings
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]			5-at Sports Events
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	6-Walking in/near Parking Lots
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	7-Walking elsewhere Outdoors

The proportions of respondents concerned about their personal safety who marked a time and location on the grid are given in Table 9, by sample and by sex. Briefly, this table indicates the following for students and employees other than police:

1) More respondents marked times from 6 P.M. to 10 P.M. and 10 P.M. to 2 A.M. than the other hours, although students also marked 2 A.M. to 6 A.M. quite often. These times correspond to the hours of darkness at this season of the year.

2) Walking in or near parking lots was the location receiving the greatest amount of response. Walking elsewhere outdoors was also cited frequently.

TABLE 9

PROPORTIONS OF RESPONDENTS CONCERNED ABOUT PERSONAL SAFETY WHO WERE CONCERNED AT SPECIFIC TIMES AND LOCATIONS

	6 AM-10 AM		10 AM-2 PM		2 PM-6 PM		6 PM-10 PM		10 PM-2 AM		2 AM-6 AM		
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	LOCATION ON CAMPUS
STUDENTS	7.1%	6.0%	3.9%	2.7%	4.5%	2.7%	8.4%	9.2%	12.3%	16.5%	16.8%	20.4%	1. in the residence halls
(155 males; 401 females)	6.4	7.7	5.2	5.2	5.8	6.7	12.3	27.7	16.8	26.9	9.0	19.4	2. in the libraries
	8.4	7.2	8.4	6.2	7.1	6.7	4.5	18.7	8.4	16.5	9.0	14.2	3. in the classrooms
	6.4	8.2	4.5	5.0	5.2	9.0	12.9	28.2	16.8	28.7	12.3	21.7	4. in other campus buildings
	-	-	7.7	3.5	8.4	6.2	14.2	10.5	-	-	-	-	5. at sports events
	19.4	22.4	12.9	12.2	14.2	24.9	38.1	78.8	69.0	73.1	52.9	54.1	6. walking in/near parking lots
	11.0	18.4	7.1	9.5	7.1	17.0	29.7	70.3	60.0	70.6	38.3	54.6	7. walking elsewhere outdoors
EMPLOYEES	1.5%	1.8%	1.5	1.8%	3.1%	2.7%	4.6%	4.5%	4.6%	2.7%	3.1%	1.8%	1. in the residence halls
(65 males; 223 females)	6.2	3.6	7.7	2.7	9.2	4.9	13.8	22.4	15.4	10.8	9.2	4.0	2. in the libraries
	3.1	1.4	4.6	2.2	7.7	2.2	15.4	11.7	12.3	4.5	4.6	1.8	3. in the classrooms
	10.8	9.4	9.2	5.8	12.3	9.4	33.8	34.5	27.7	16.1	15.4	9.0	4. in other campus buildings
	-	-	4.6	1.4	10.8	1.8	13.8	8.5	-	-	-	-	5. at sports events
	15.4	18.4	12.3	7.2	23.1	20.6	56.9	75.8	44.6	34.1	21.5	15.7	6. walking in/near parking lots
	15.4	6.7	12.3	6.7	20.0	12.1	52.3	54.3	43.1	27.8	23.1	12.1	7. walking elsewhere outdoors
POLICE	41.7%	0.0%	41.7%	0.0%	41.7%	0.0%	58.3%	0.0%	75.0%	0.0%	75.0%	0.0%	1. in the residence halls
(12 males; 2 females)	41.7	0.0	41.7	0.0	41.7	0.0	58.3	0.0	66.7	0.0	66.7	0.0	2. in the libraries
	41.7	0.0	41.7	0.0	41.7	0.0	50.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	75.0	0.0	3. in the classrooms
	41.7	0.0	41.7	0.0	41.7	0.0	58.3	0.0	83.3	0.0	83.3	0.0	4. in other campus buildings
	-	-	41.7	0.0	50.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	-	-	-	-	5. at sports events
	41.7	50.0	41.7	0.0	41.7	0.0	58.3	50.0	83.3	0.0	83.3	0.0	6. walking in/near parking lots
	41.7	50.0	41.7	0.0	41.7	0.0	58.3	50.0	83.3	0.0	83.3	0.0	7. walking elsewhere outdoors

3) As one would expect, greater proportions of students than of employees indicated concern about their safety in the residence halls. The proportion of students indicating concern in the residence halls is fairly substantial when one considers the fact that only 30 percent of student respondents lived on campus. A substantial proportion of students also expressed concern about safety in the libraries, classroom buildings, and other campus buildings.

4) Employees were more likely than students to indicate concern in "other campus buildings." This location includes employee offices.

Among male police respondents who indicated they were concerned about their personal safety, the table indicates a large number of areas and times of concern.

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether they were concerned about the safety of their personal belongings on campus. Table 10 gives the total number of respondents who answered the questions and the proportions of these respondents who were concerned, by sample and by sex.

Table 10.

Total numbers of respondents and proportions concerned about the safety of their personal belongings.

Sex	Sample: Students	Employees	Police
Males	P = .796 N = 319	P = .704 N = 260	P = .667 N = 27
Females	P = .772 N = 435	P = .807 N = 306	P = .500 N = 4
All Respondents	P = .782 N = 754	P = .760 N = 566	P = .645 N = 31

Approximately equal proportions of male and female student respondents were concerned about the safety of their belongings, whereas a larger proportion of female than of male employee respondents were concerned about the safety of their personal belongings. Overall, about three-quarters of student and of employee respondents were concerned about the safety of their personal property on campus.

The respondents who expressed concern about the safety of their personal belongings were asked to indicate on a grid, as shown below, when and where they had this concern.

TIME OF DAY						
6 AM-10 AM	10 AM-2 PM	2 PM-6 PM	6 PM-10 PM	10 PM-2 AM	2 AM-6 AM	LOCATION ON CAMPUS
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	1-in the Residence Halls
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	2-in the Libraries
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	3-in the Classrooms
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	4-in Other Campus Buildings
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]			5-at Sports Events
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	6-Vehicles Parked on Campus
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	7-Bicycle Racks Outdoors

The proportions of respondents concerned about the safety of their personal belongings on campus who marked a time and location on the grid are given in Table 11, by sample and by sex. The following results are most notable:

1) Among students the residence halls were a frequently cited location of concern. Other major areas were the libraries and vehicles parked on campus, with evening hours the times that were marked most frequently.
2) Among employees, "other campus buildings" as well as vehicles parked on campus were the major areas of concern. Greater proportions of male employees than of female employees were concerned about personal belongings in other campus buildings in the hours after 6 P.M.
3) Among police, the major area of concern was vehicles parked on campus.

In order to put into perspective the degree of concern of respondents, they were asked to indicate whether they were more or less concerned about their personal safety and about the safety of their belongings on campus or in their home neighborhood. Respondents could indicate "more concern on campus" (= 1), "same in both areas" (= 2), or "less concern on campus" (= 3). The mean responses for these questions are given by sample and by sex in Tables 12 and 13.

TABLE 11

PROPORTIONS OF RESPONDENTS CONCERNED ABOUT SAFETY OF PERSONAL BELONGINGS WHO WERE CONCERNED AT SPECIFIC TIMES AND LOCATIONS

	6 AM-10 AM		10 AM-2 PM		2 PM-6 PM		6 PM-10 PM		10 PM-2 AM		2 AM-6 AM		
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	LOCATION ON CAMPUS
STUDENTS	20.5%	26.2%	26.4%	28.6%	26.0%	28.6%	25.6%	28.9%	28.0%	30.4%	28.7%	28.9%	1. in the residence halls
(254 males;	28.4	38.7	40.9	47.3	40.9	49.1	43.7	56.2	31.1	42.9	22.0	32.7	2. in the libraries
336 females)	20.1	25.6	27.6	31.2	26.4	29.8	17.7	28.3	12.2	19.4	12.2	14.6	3. in the classrooms
	14.6	25.0	20.5	28.9	20.1	30.6	16.9	33.3	15.4	25.6	14.2	19.9	4. in other campus buildings
	-	-	13.0	14.3	14.2	16.7	15.4	18.4	-	-	-	-	5. at sports events
	40.6	43.4	49.2	46.4	46.8	46.7	50.0	56.6	46.1	51.5	38.6	40.5	6. vehicles parked on campus
	15.8	20.8	16.5	20.5	16.1	21.1	17.7	22.6	18.9	22.0	17.3	19.9	7. bicycle racks outdoors
EMPLOYEES	2.2%	3.2%	2.2%	4.9%	2.7%	4.4%	2.7%	4.0%	2.7%	2.0%	2.2%	2.0%	1. in the residence halls
(183 males;	12.6	14.6	15.8	20.2	17.5	21.0	14.2	21.0	10.9	12.2	10.4	6.5	2. in the libraries
247 females)	9.8	9.3	12.0	14.6	12.6	13.4	13.7	12.6	10.9	6.9	10.4	5.7	3. in the classrooms
	43.2	42.5	43.2	51.4	44.8	51.0	59.6	38.5	57.9	23.1	51.9	18.2	4. in other campus buildings
	-	-	4.9	4.4	6.0	5.3	6.0	6.9	-	-	-	-	5. at sports events
	25.7	30.8	29.5	34.4	31.2	35.6	34.4	36.0	27.9	21.5	22.4	14.6	6. vehicles parked on campus
	9.3	5.7	10.9	7.3	12.0	6.5	10.9	7.3	9.8	4.4	8.7	4.9	7. bicycle racks outdoors
POLICE	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%	38.9%	0.0%	38.9%	0.0%	1. in the residence halls
(18 males;	16.7	0.0	22.2	0.0	22.2	0.0	27.8	0.0	33.3	0.0	38.9	0.0	2. in the libraries
2 females)	16.7	0.0	22.2	0.0	22.2	0.0	27.8	0.0	44.4	0.0	50.0	0.0	3. in the classrooms
	27.8	50.0	33.3	50.0	33.3	50.0	38.9	50.0	55.6	0.0	55.6	0.0	4. in other campus buildings
	-	-	16.7	0.0	22.2	0.0	38.9	0.0	-	-	-	-	5. at sports events
	66.7	0.0	66.7	0.0	66.7	0.0	72.2	0.0	88.9	0.0	88.9	0.0	6. vehicles parked on campus
	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	22.2	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	7. bicycle racks outdoors

Table 12.

Concern about personal safety:
on campus vs. in home neighborhood.

Sex	Students		Employees		Police	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Males	1.71	318	1.85	261	1.88	26
Females	1.33	434	1.59	305	2.25	4
Total	1.49	752	1.71	566	1.93	30

Remembering that a lower mean value indicates relatively greater concern on campus than in one's home neighborhood, one finds that students were more likely than employees, and females were more likely than males, to be more concerned for their personal safety on campus than in their home neighborhood.

Table 13.

Concern about safety of personal belongings:
on campus vs. in home neighborhood.

Sex	Students		Employees		Police	
	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Males	1.44	319	1.57	261	1.81	27
Females	1.42	430	1.55	301	2.25	4
Total	1.43	749	1.56	562	1.87	31

In regard to the safety of one's personal belongings, students were more likely than employees to indicate they were more concerned about their belongings on campus than in their home neighborhood. There was no significant difference by sex of respondents.

On-Campus and Commuting Students

As mentioned earlier, greater proportions of on-campus students than of off-campus students were concerned about personal safety and about the safety of their belongings. This was true for men and for women, as shown in Tables 14 and 15. As these tables indicate, more than half of the students were concerned about their personal safety and the safety of their belongings. The proportions concerned were larger for on-campus residents than for commuters. Of on-campus respondents, 84 percent were concerned with their personal safety on campus, and 86 percent were concerned with the safety of their personal belongings. Of student respondents who were commuters, 70 percent were concerned about their personal safety and 75 percent were concerned about the safety of their belongings. Among women on-campus residents who responded, 97 percent were concerned about their personal safety on campus. The response rate for this group of women was 37 percent

Table 14.

Total numbers of respondents and proportions concerned about their personal safety.

	Males	Females	Both Sexes
On Campus	P = .670 N = 94	P = .969 N = 128	P = .842 N = 222
Commuters	P = .411 N = 224	P = .905 N = 306	P = .696 N = 530

Table 15.

Total numbers of respondents and proportions concerned about the safety of their personal belongings.

	Males	Females	Both Sexes
On Campus	P = .871 N = 93	P = .845 N = 129	P = .856 N = 222
Commuters	P = .764 N = 225	P = .742 N = 306	P = .751 N = 531

Differences Among Employee Categories

Among the major employee categories, there were differences by sex and by category in the proportions expressing concern about their own or their belongings' safety. See Tables 16 and 17. In regard to personal safety, one finds that 87 percent of female faculty respondents and only 22 percent of male faculty respondents were concerned about their personal safety on campus. The proportions of female associate staff and of female classified employee respondents who were concerned were about 70 percent, whereas the proportions of the male respondents in these employment categories who were concerned were 30 and 27 percent, respectively. In regard to the safety of personal belongings, the disparity in proportions of men and women employees in the various categories who were concerned was substantially less than in regard to personal safety.

Table 16.

Total number of employee respondents to the question about personal safety, and proportions concerned.

	Category		
Sex	Faculty	Associate Staff	Classified
Males	P = .224 N = 165	P = .302 N = 43	P = .271 N = 48
Females	P = .871 N = 62	P = .688 N = 48	P = .696 N = 191
All Respondents	P = .401 N = 227	P = .505 N = 91	P = .611 N = 239

Table 17.

Total number of employee respondents to the question about safety of personal belongings, and proportions concerned.

	Category		
Sex	Faculty	Associate Staff	Classified
Males	P = .768 N = 164	P = .591 N = 44	P = .596 N = 47
Females	P = .855 N = 62	P = .796 N = 49	P = .796 N = 191
All Respondents	P = .792 N = 226	P = .699 N = 93	P = .756 N = 238

Security Measures and Services

Awareness of nine campus security measures and services is indicated in Table 18, by sample and by sex. Most police respondents were aware of all of the services. Among students and among employees the services of which the largest proportions were aware were UMCP police vehicle patrols and the escort service. Thirty percent or fewer of the student and of the employee

Table 18.

Percent of respondents aware of security measures or services.

Security Measures or Services	Student Sample			Employee Sample			Police Sample		
	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total
Foot Patrols (Student and/or Police)	60.7%	53.3%	56.5%	58.8%	42.2%	49.8%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
UMCP Police Vehicle Patrols	90.0	85.1	87.2	86.6	82.1	84.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
Escort Service	85.0	87.6	86.5	72.9	76.6	74.9	100.0	100.0	100.0
Call-A-Ride	64.5	67.5	66.2	53.4	46.8	49.8	96.3	100.0	96.8
Blue Emergency Phones	56.7	42.3	48.4	59.5	40.9	49.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
Increased Security Lighting Outdoors	65.4	53.1	58.3	73.7	64.6	68.8	92.6	100.0	93.5
Police Assistant Patrols at Doors to Libraries/Other Buildings	32.4	21.7	26.3	24.0	18.8	21.2	92.6	100.0	93.5
Residence Hall Security Program	34.6	27.2	30.3	25.6	18.5	21.8	96.3	100.0	96.8
UMCP Police Crime Prevention Programs	23.4	19.9	21.4	36.6	26.0	30.9	96.3	100.0	96.8

respondents were aware of the police assistant patrols at doors to libraries or other buildings, the residence hall security program, or UMCP police crime prevention programs. It is perhaps important to note that a large number of respondents commented on the survey form that more publicity should be given to the security measures and services that are available.

Respondents were also asked to indicate whether they had used any of five campus security measures or services. Proportions of respondents who indicated they had used one or more of the services are given in Table 19. Note that many police indicated they had used these services. Some of these respondents may actually have been providing the services in question, thus accounting for some of these responses. Among all student respondents 17 percent of men and 36 percent of women indicated they had used one or more of the services. Call-a-ride was the service that had been used by more students than any other service. Among employee respondents, 18 percent of men and only 12 percent of women indicated they had used any of the services. The UMCP police crime prevention programs were the most frequently indicated service, used by 10 percent of employee respondents.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they thought current campus security measures or services are adequate. Respondents could answer "yes," "no," or "don't know." Results are given in Table 20.

Table 19.

Percent of respondents who have used security measures or services.

Security Measures or Services	Student Sample			Employee Sample			Police Sample		
	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total
Escort Service	1.6%	14.0%	8.7%	1.9%	3.9%	3.0%	11.1%	0.0%	9.7%
Call-A-Ride	8.7	24.0	17.5	1.1	2.3	1.8	14.8	0.0	12.9
Blue Emergency Phones	1.6	0.2	0.8	1.9	1.0	1.4	59.3	25.0	54.8
Residence Hall Security Program	6.9	9.8	8.6	1.9	0.6	1.2	22.2	0.0	19.4
UMCP Police Crime Prevention Programs	2.8	4.8	4.0	14.5	6.2	10.0	44.4	25.0	41.9
Used one or more Services	17.4%	36.2%	28.2%	17.9%	12.3%	14.9%	66.7%	25.0%	61.3%

Table 20.

Responses to question "Are security measures adequate?"

Sample

	Students		Employees		Police	
Responses	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Yes	25.3%	10.2%	17.5%	8.3%	25.0%	33.3%
No	39.6	60.5	39.7	46.0	75.0	66.7
Don't know	35.1	29.3	42.9	45.7	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Responses	316	430	252	300	24	3

In all samples and for both sexes, larger proportions of respondents indicated that measures were not adequate than indicated they were adequate. A substantial proportion of student and employee respondents indicated they didn't know whether or not services were adequate.

Respondents were asked to indicate what changes, if any, they would recommend in nine security measures or services. Responses are given in Table 21 for students, employees, and police. Note that there was a high rate of nonresponse to some items, probably caused by lack of knowledge of the service. The percentages in the tables are the percentages of those who responded to a given item.

TABLE 21

CHANGES RECOMMENDED BY GROUPS OF RESPONDENTS

	OK Now	Decrease	Improve	Increase	Improve & Increase	Total Number of Responses to Item	Security measure or service
STUDENTS	17.2%	1.5%	15.7%	59.3%	6.3%	536	1. Foot patrols
	34.1	2.4	18.5	39.6	5.4	498	2. UMCP Police Vehicle Patrols
	53.3	0.9	16.6	25.4	3.7	433	3. Escort Service
	60.4	0.7	18.3	18.6	2.0	409	4. Call-A-Ride
	34.1	0.5	10.5	50.2	4.6	410	5. Blue Emergency Phones
	11.9	0.7	15.7	56.7	15.0	573	6. Security Lighting Outdoors
	37.0	1.7	32.5	22.9	5.9	354	7. Residence Hall Security Programs
	35.1	1.1	24.9	33.7	5.2	362	8. Police Crime Prevention Programs
	38.1	3.5	15.9	37.3	5.2	402	9. Police Assistant Patrols at Doors to Libraries and Other Buildings
EMPLOYEES	11.1%	1.0%	15.7%	62.6%	9.5%	305	1. Foot patrols
	23.3	1.8	18.3	48.4	8.2	279	2. UMCP Police Vehicle Patrols
	43.7	1.3	24.1	25.3	5.7	158	3. Escort Service
	55.8	2.2	19.6	18.8	3.6	138	4. Call-A-Ride
	35.7	2.3	15.2	43.3	3.5	171	5. Blue Emergency Phones
	11.1	2.4	20.6	51.2	14.6	287	6. Security Lighting Outdoors
	35.5	1.6	33.9	22.6	6.5	124	7. Residence Hall Security Programs
	27.2	1.1	27.2	35.0	9.4	180	8. Police Crime Prevention Programs
	26.9	1.7	22.9	42.9	5.7	175	9. Police Assistant Patrols at Doors to Libraries and Other Buildings
POLICE	34.6%	3.8%	3.8%	50.0%	7.7%	26	1. Foot patrols
	17.2	3.4	20.7	48.3	10.3	29	2. UMCP Police Vehicle Patrols
	42.9	0.0	38.1	14.3	4.8	21	3. Escort Service
	57.1	0.0	23.8	19.0	0.0	21	4. Call-A-Ride
	41.7	0.0	12.5	33.3	12.5	24	5. Blue Emergency Phones
	20.8	0.0	20.8	41.7	16.7	24	6. Security Lighting Outdoors
	33.3	0.0	33.3	20.8	12.5	24	7. Residence Hall Security Programs
	12.0	4.0	44.0	28.0	12.0	25	8. Police Crime Prevention Programs
	60.0	5.0	15.0	20.0	0.0	20	9. Police Assistant Patrols at Doors to Libraries and Other Buildings

We will now consider the security services or measures item by item:

1) Foot patrols--the majority of all groups of respondents said these should be increased or improved and increased.
2) UMCP police vehicle patrols--a majority of employee and of police respondents and 45 percent of student respondents said these should be increased or improved and increased. Thirty-four percent of student respondents said this service is all right now.
3) Escort Service--a majority of students and approximately 43 percent of employees and police indicated this service is all right now.
4) Call-a-ride--a majority of all groups of respondents indicated this service is all right now.
5) Blue emergency phones--fifty-five percent of student respondents said to increase or improve and increase this service, as did 47 percent of employee respondents and 46 percent of police respondents. Forty-two percent of police respondents indicated this service was all right now.

6) Security lighting outdoors--a majority of all groups of respondents indicated this measure should be increased or improved and increased.

7) Residence hall security programs--approximately one-third of each group of respondents indicated this service was all right now, whereas somewhat more than a third said this service should be improved or improved and increased.

8) Police crime prevention programs--there were different patterns of response for the three groups of respondents. One third of student respondents indicated these programs were all right now, and 39 percent indicated they should be increased or improved and increased. Among employee respondents, 44 percent said they should be increased or improved and increased. Among police respondents, 56 percent indicated the programs should be improved or improved and increased.

9) Police assistant patrols--forty-two percent of student respondents and 48 percent of employee respondents indicated this service should be increased or improved and increased. Sixty percent of police respondents indicated this service is all right now.

The final survey question asked respondents to indicate whether a greater or smaller proportion of the UMCP campus budget

should be spent on campus security. Twenty-five percent of employee respondents and 14 percent of student respondents omitted this question. Many indicated that they did not know what proportion of the budget is spent on security. Responses were coded as follows:

1 = a greater proportion

2 = about the same proportion

3 = a smaller proportion.

As indicated in Table 22, women were more likely than men, and students were more likely than employees, to indicate that a greater proportion of the budget should be spent on security. Nearly all of the police respondents were in favor of increasing the proportion of the budget spent for campus security. In all these respondent groups, the average response was between "1"--a greater proportion and "2"--about the same proportion.

Table 22.

Attitude toward increasing proportion of budget for security.

	Students		Employees		Police	
Sex	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N
Males	1.58	282	1.66	190	1.14	22
Females	1.24	373	1.38	238	1.00	4
Total	1.38	655	1.50	428	1.12	26

In addition to the questions discussed above, survey respondents were asked to indicate any specific suggestions they had about security measures or services on campus. A large number of

comments were received, including 233 from the 758 student respondents and 154 from the 601 employee and police respondents. Comments covered many topics, but frequently included the following:

1) the need to turn on the security lighting that has been installed;
2) the need for more lighting in particular unlighted areas;
3) the need for more publicity about security measures and services;
4) the need for more residence hall security measures;
5) concern about security of university and personal property in offices and laboratories, especially at night;
6) requests for closer parking spaces for those on campus at night; and
7) suggestions concerning the UMCP police.

A separate document, which is a compilation of all comments is available.

Summary

A survey of security measures and services at the University of Maryland at College Park was distributed in May 1983 to randomly selected members of three populations--students, employees, and UMCP police. The sampling proportions for these populations

were 10 percent, 30 percent, and 100 percent, respectively. The estimated response rates were 25 percent for students, 31 percent for employees, and 46 percent for police.

Higher rates of response were obtained from women than from men, and from on-campus students than from commuters. Among employees, the estimated response rates were highest for associate staff (64 percent), followed by faculty (30 percent), and classified employees including housekeepers (25 percent). The high rate of nonresponse was expected for a mail survey without follow-up, and was exacerbated by the fact that the survey was conducted during the last two weeks of the term.

Greater rates of response among women and on campus students were associated with greater proportions of these respondents being concerned about their personal and/or belongings' safety on campus, causing a probable bias in the survey results. If nonresponse were in part because of a lack of concern with security, proportions of the survey respondents who were concerned would overestimate the proportions concerned among the survey populations. Because of the problem of nonresponse bias, the results of this study can only be generalized to the respondents to the survey, rather than to the survey populations.

The survey focused on two major areas: concern about one's safety or the safety of one's personal belongings on campus; and the awareness, use, and assessment of campus security measures or services.

In regard to concern for one's personal safety, higher proportions of women than of men, and higher proportions of student than of employee respondents, indicated concern. Large proportions of persons expressing concern about their personal safety indicated that the nighttime hours were of concern. The primary areas of concern were walking in or near parking lots and walking elsewhere outdoors. Substantial proportions of students expressed concern about their safety in the residence halls, the libraries, classroom buildings, and other campus buildings. Somewhat greater proportions of employees than of students were concerned about their safety in other campus buildings, e.g., in offices.

In regard to the safety of one's belongings, over 76 percent of employee and student respondents indicated concern, with greater proportions of women employees than of men expressing concern. All respondent groups expressed concern about the safety of vehicles parked on campus. Among students, residence halls and libraries were also major areas of concern. Among employees, other campus buildings were the major area of concern.

On average, respondents indicated that they were more concerned about their safety and their belongings' safety on campus than in their home neighborhood.

Awareness of security measures and services varied by type of service, with the largest proportions of employees and students aware of UMCP police vehicle patrols and the escort

service. Fewer student and employee respondents were aware of the residence hall security program, police assistant patrols at doors to libraries or other buildings, or UMCP police crime prevention programs.

The service that the largest number of student respondents had used was call-a-ride. The service that the largest number of employee respondents had used was UMCP police crime prevention programs. The total proportions of respondents who reported they had used any of the five services was 28 percent of students and 15 percent of employees.

In assessing the adequacy of security measures and services, in all three respondent groups and for both sexes, larger proportions of respondents indicated that measures were not adequate than indicated they were adequate. A substantial proportion of student and employee respondents indicated they did not know whether or not services were adequate.

When asked to indicate what changes if any should be made in nine security measures or services, the responses varied by type of service and by respondent group. Among the findings were the following:

1) student and police foot patrols should be increased, or improved and increased;
2) call-a-ride is all right at present;

3) security lighting outdoors should be increased, or improved and increased; and

4) police respondents tended to indicate that police crime prevention programs should be improved, or improved and increased.

Regarding the question of whether a greater or smaller proportion of the campus budget should be spent on security, of those who responded the mean response supported increasing the proportion spent on campus security.

Finally, a large number of respondents made specific suggestions concerning security measures and services on campus. A separate document, which is a compilation of all comments, is available.

REFERENCE LIST

Kish, L., Survey sampling. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Lansing, J.B., & Morgan, J.N., Economic survey methods. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Survey Research Center, 1971.

REFERENCE NOTE

1. Sturtz, C.F. Cover letter to survey, May 4, 1983.

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK 20742

OFFICE OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR
FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS
301-454-4795

May 4, 1983

TO: Members of the Campus Community

In response to inquiries from the Board of Regents as well as members of the UMCP community and at the direction of Chancellor Slaughter, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Administrative Affairs is conducting a study of the Campus's security concerns and responsive services. As part of this, the perceptions and comments of members of the Campus community are being sought. The objective of this study is to assess the actual and perceived degree of security problems and the levels of responsiveness the various campus service units are able to achieve with the resources available to them.

I appreciate greatly, particularly at this very busy time of the year, if you would take time to complete and return the attached survey to the Office of Institutional Studies, Room 2110, Turner Laboratory, Campus. Your response will help this effort immeasurably.

Thank you,

Charles F. Sturtz
Vice Chancellor for
Administrative Affairs

CFS:bac

NOTE: PLEASE RETURN THE SURVEY IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE BY MAY 18.

S

Please answer the following questions and return the survey in the envelope provided by May 18. Your responses are confidential. Thank you very much for your assistance.

PLEASE COMPLETE THE ANSWERS TO THE FOLLOWING TWO QUESTIONS.

A. Approximately how many years have you spent at UMCP as a student and/or faculty/staff member? _____

B. What is your age in years? _____

PLEASE CHECK THE BOX OF THE CORRECT RESPONSE FOR ALL REMAINING QUESTIONS.

C. What is your current student and/or employee status? Check all boxes that are true for you.

STUDENT CATEGORIES
- [1] Freshman
- [2] Sophomore
- [3] Junior
- [4] Senior
- [5] Graduate Student
- [6] Other Student (please specify) _____

EMPLOYEE CATEGORIES
- [11] Faculty
- [12] Associate Staff
- [13] Classified, other than Housekeepers or Police
- [14] Housekeeper
- [15] UMCP Police
- [16] Graduate Assistant
- [17] Other Employee (please specify) _____

D. Do you live on-campus or do you commute to campus?
- [1] On-campus
- [2] Commute

E. If you commute to campus, how do you usually get to campus?
- [1] on Foot
- [2] by Bicycle
- [3] by Car or Motorcycle
- [4] by Shuttle UM
- [5] by Public Transportation
- [6] Other (please specify) _____

F. What is your sex?
- [1] Male
- [2] Female

G. What is your racial/ethnic category?
- [1] American Indian or Alaskan Native
- [2] Black, not of Hispanic origin
- [3] Asian or Pacific Islander
- [4] Hispanic
- [5] White, not of Hispanic origin
- [6] Other

H. Are you concerned about your personal safety on campus?

[1] Yes
[2] No

If your answer was YES, check the boxes on the following grid to indicate where and when you are concerned about your personal safety on campus. Check as many boxes as are true for you.

TIME OF DAY						
6 AM-10 AM	10 AM-2 PM	2 PM-6 PM	6 PM-10 PM	10 PM-2 AM	2 AM-6 AM	LOCATION ON CAMPUS
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	1 - in the Residence Halls
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	2 - in the Libraries
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	3 - in the Classrooms
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	4 - in Other Campus Buildings
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]			5 - at Sports Events
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	6 - Walking in/near Parking Lots
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	7 - Walking elsewhere Outdoors

I. Do you have more or less concern about your personal safety when on campus than you do in your home neighborhood?

[1] More Concern on Campus
[2] Same in Both Areas
[3] Less Concern on Campus

J. Are you concerned about the safety of your personal belongings on campus?

[1] Yes
[2] No

If your answer was YES, check the boxes on the following grid to indicate where and when you are concerned about the safety of your personal belongings on campus. Check as many boxes as are true for you.

TIME OF DAY						
6 AM-10 AM	10 AM-2 PM	2 PM-6 PM	6 PM-10 PM	10 PM-2 AM	2 AM-6 AM	LOCATION ON CAMPUS
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	1 - in the Residence Halls
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	2 - in the Libraries
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	3 - in the Classrooms
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	4 - in Other Campus Buildings
	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]			5 - at Sports Events
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	6 - Vehicles Parked on Campus
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	7 - Bicycle Racks Outdoors

K. Do you have more or less concern about the safety of your personal belongings when on campus than you do in your home neighborhood?

[1] More Concern on Campus
[2] Same in Both Areas
[3] Less Concern on Campus

Are you aware that the following campus security measures and services exist? Check boxes for those that you know exist.

[ ] 1 - Foot Patrols (student and/or police)
[ ] 2 - UMCP Police Vehicle Patrols
[ ] 3 - Escort Service
[ ] 4 - Call-A-Ride
[ ] 5 - Blue Emergency Phones
[ ] 6 - Increased Security Lighting Outdoors
[ ] 7 - Police Assistant Patrols at Doors to Libraries/Other Buildings
[ ] 8 - Residence Hall Security Program
[ ] 9 - UMCP Police Crime Prevention Programs, like operation identification

M. Which of the following campus security measures or services have you used? Check boxes for all that you have used.

[ ] 1 - Escort Service
[ ] 2 - Call-A-Ride
[ ] 3 - Blue Emergency Phones
[ ] 4 - Residence Hall Security Program
[ ] 5 - UMCP Police Crime Prevention Programs, like operation identification

N. Do you think current campus security measures or services are adequate as they are now?

[1] Yes
[2] No
[3] Don't Know

O. What changes, if any, would you recommend in the following measures or services? Check all the boxes that indicate your response.

INCREASE	IMPROVE	DECREASE	OK NOW	SECURITY MEASURES OR SERVICES
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	1 - Foot Patrols (student/police)
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	2 - UMCP Police Vehicle Patrols
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	3 - Escort Service
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	4 - Call-A-Ride
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	5 - Blue Emergency Phones
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	6 - Security Lighting Outdoors
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	7 - Residence Hall Security Program
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	8 - Police Crime Prevention Programs
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	9 - Police Assistant Patrols at Doors to Libraries and Other Buildings

P. Do you believe that a greater or smaller proportion of the UMCP campus budget should be spent on campus security?

[1] a Greater Proportion
[2] About the Same Proportion
[3] a Smaller Proportion

lease indicate any specific suggestions you have about security measures
r services on campus. Thank you very much for completing this survey.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE